

LibLearnX 2024 Proposal Review Rubric

CRITERIA	EXCELLENT = 4	GOOD = 3	FAIR = 2	POOR = 1
PROPOSAL TITLE & DESCRIPTION: Does the title clearly describe the program and does the program description clearly, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation? <i>WEIGHT: 3</i>	Title is clear, concise, and reflects the proposed program. Description is well-written and concise yet detailed. Audience can rely on the title and description for an accurate idea of the program to be presented.	Title is clear and generally relevant. Description is somewhat detailed and generally easy to understand. It explains the project to some extent but does not fully detail the presenter's plans.	Title is unclear and/or is an inaccurate description of the proposed program. Description lacks sufficient detail and/or is difficult to understand.	Title is unrelated to the proposed program and it is unclear what program is being proposed.
RELEVANCE TO CONTENT AREA & ALIGNMENT WITH ALA CORE VALUES: Is the program relevant to the Content Area it seeks to address and does the proposal support one or more of the ALA Core Values? <i>WEIGHT: 4</i>	The proposed program is fundamental to the Content Area chosen, and the proposal clearly articulates a relationship to one (or more) of the core values.	The proposed program is of value to the Content Area chosen, and the proposal indicates a relationship to one (or more) of the core values.	The proposed program is somewhat relevant to the Content Area chosen, but the proposal does not make clear a relationship to one (or more) of the core values.	The proposed program does not appear relevant to the Content Area chosen, and the proposal does not suggest any relationship to the core values.
LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Are learning objectives clear, specific, observable, and actionable? <i>WEIGHT: 4</i>	Learning objectives are clear and specific. There are at least two measurable goals.	Learning objectives are generally clear and specific. There is at least one learning outcome specified.	Learning objectives are vague and will be difficult to assess.	Learning objectives are not specified.

CRITERIA	EXCELLENT = 4	GOOD = 3	FAIR = 2	POOR = 1
TIMELINESS/DEMAND: Is the topic timely, new and/or in-demand? <i>WEIGHT: 3</i>	The topic is an emerging "hot" topic and/or a topic for which there is demonstrated high demand.	While this topic has been explored, it remains an in-demand topic.	This topic has been presented often/recently, and interest may be declining.	There is so much content on this topic that there is little demand and/or the topic is not timely.
INNOVATION: Does the content offer fresh, innovative ideas, methods, or resources? <i>WEIGHT: 4</i>	The proposed program is transformational to the field. It contributes an innovative approach or resource to an original topic.	The proposed program is innovative but may not have a transformational impact.	The proposed program contributes a new approach or resource to a common topic.	The proposed program takes a common approach to a common topic.
PRESENTATION/ENGAGEMENT STYLE*: Is the proposed presentation likely to engage participants actively in discussion, thought, or hands on learning? <i>WEIGHT: 3</i>	The proposal clearly describes multiple strategies for active engagement and/or interaction of the attendees.	The proposal clearly describes at least one strategy for active engagement and/or interaction.	The proposal suggests active engagement and/or interaction, but the description of the strategy is unclear.	The proposal does not suggest any strategies for active engagement and/or interaction.
TARGET AUDIENCE: Is the target audience appropriate to the content, and does the proposal address its relevance to this audience? <i>WEIGHT: 2</i>	The proposal clearly defines the target audience and details the significance of the topic to that audience.	The proposal specifies the target audience but needs more detail about the relevance of the topic to that audience.	The proposal generically states the target audience and does not explain the relevance of the topic to that audience.	The proposal does not identify the target audience.
INCLUSION OF PERSPECTIVES: Does the proposal demonstrate inclusion and representation of multiple, diverse perspectives? <i>WEIGHT: 3</i>	The proposal integrates multiple perspectives with a cohesive theme, including a traditionally underrepresented identity.	The proposal takes into account multiple perspectives.	The proposal has a narrow representation of perspectives.	The proposal does not make the perspectives clear.

*This criterion applies to Accelerator, Learning Lab, and Ideas Xchange only.